



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/084,787	05/21/1998	SHINICHIROU HARASAWA	FUJH13.010A	5949

7590

09/11/2003

KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN
575 MADISON AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10022-2585

EXAMINER

MOSKOWITZ, NELSON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3663

37

Remitted

DATE MAILED: 09/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/084,787	05/21/1998	SHINICHIROU HARASAWA	FUJH13.010A	5949

7590

09/10/2002

KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN
575 MADISON AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10022

EXAMINER

MOSKOWITZ, NELSON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3663

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2002

revised
8/8/3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/084,787

Applicant(s)

HARASAWA ET AL.

Examiner

Nelson Moskowitz

Art Unit

3663

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 March 2002 and 20 June 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |

Art Unit: 3663

1. Applicant's letters received March 20, 2002 and June 20, 2002, have been made of record and the amendments to the claims has been entered.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claims 15-19 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosure of the prior art (Fig. 15 and pages 3-4 of the instant specification) or Aida et al, when taken with Heidemann ('109).

In determining obviousness, the following factual determinations are made:

- a. First, the scope and content of the prior art.
- b. Second, the difference between the prior art and the pending claims.
- c. Third, the level of skill of a person on ordinary skill in this art;
- d. Fourth, whether other objective evidence may be present, which indicates obviousness or nonobviousness. See, e.g., *In re Dembiczak*, 175 F.3d 994, 998, 50 USPQ2d 1614, 1616 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (citing *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 282 US 1, 17-18, USPQ 456, 466-67 (1966)).

Objective evidence includes long felt but unmet need for the claimed invention, failure of others to solve the problem addressed by the claimed invention, and not other factors. See, e.g., *Simmons Fastener Corp. v. Illinois Tool Works, Inc.*, 739 Fed. 1573, 1574-76, 22 USPQ 744, 745-47 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

Examining the scope and content of the prior art one finds the following:

Art Unit: 3663

a. Applicant's discussion of the prior art presents a prior art optical amplifier with an input terminal receiving an optical signal, an optical coupler (10), a detector (11), and an optical fiber amplifier (12). Fig. 15 of Applicant's disclosure is identified as prior art and contains these components. In addition Applicant admits in the specification that this prior art system included input signal monitoring wherein a detector was used to monitor the input signal by measuring the level of a portion thereof. Applicant further states (page 4, lines 1-12) that the noise problems from, inter alia, pump light, appeared when the signal level was low. Applicant has not averred that the prior art did not recognize the problem of noise from pump radiation counter-propagating to the signal radiation and then impinging on the detector. This S/N deterioration is admitted to have made it very difficult for the prior art to accurately monitor high and low level input signals for the desired ALC control. In fact, Applicant specifically states (specification, page 4, lines 11-12) "Accordingly, the input power cannot be normally measured."(emphasis added).

Therefore the prior art was well aware of the problem of pump radiation noise critically reducing the signal/noise ratio necessary for proper operation of the amplifier. Again, Applicant has not contended to the contrary.

Aida et al disclose signal input splitting and mounting so as to control pump power (see, inter alia, Fig. 1A), i.e. the same structure as claimed, except for the filter.

b. Heidemann is directed to fiber optic amplifiers and teaches the use of optical filters positioned downstream and upstream of an optical amplifier to block pump radiation having passed through the amplifier. This pump radiation filtering clearly provides a lower noise level

Art Unit: 3663

and clearer and cleaner signal radiation data to the detector (1) which operates in an AGC mode to control pump power of the fiber optical amplifier.

While Heidemann is cited to show the use of filters to remove pump light noise and pass only signals in a optical amplifier system, official notice is taken that optical filtering of optical noise prior to signal detection to improve S/N is very old and well known by artisans in this art technology. Applicants have not asserted to the contrary.

Secondly, under Deere, the difference between this prior art and the pending claims lies in the combination of an optical filter to the fiber section leading from the coupler to the input detector of Aida et al or Applicant's disclosed prior art in order to remove pump noise.

Third, under *Deere*, the level of ordinary skill in this art may be determined by the analysis of the Court as set forth in *Environment Designs Ltd. v. Union Oil Co.*, 713 F. 3d 693, 281 USPQ 865-69 (Fed. Cir. 1983) cert. denied, 464 1043 (1984), where the court listed factors relevant to a determination of the level of ordinary skill; type of problems encountered in the art, prior art solutions, rapidity of innovations, sophistication of technology, and educational level of active worker in the field.

The types of problems encountered in the art involve highly complex optics and quantum electronics, and how to provide inexpensive, accurate and reliable, noise reduction.

Innovation in this field has been very fast as can be seen from virtual birth of this field in the 1970s to its present highly complex and sophisticated status.

Art Unit: 3663

Prior art solutions include noise filtering. Skilled artisans generally have graduate level education and over seven (7) years of experience, as can be seen from published articles in the major journals in this field, e.g. IEEE Journal of Quantum Electronic, Optical Communications, Optics, etc.

To date, no secondary consideration (objective evidence) has been presented.

Therefore, as this prior art taught the need for pump radiation filtering and showed utilization of pump radiation filters in fiber optic amplifier systems to provide clean signals to detectors, the combination would have been obvious to one skilled in the art.

A further indication of the obvious matter nature of the aforesaid combination is the expectancy of the beneficial results from using the optical filter. This follows just as unexpected beneficial results would be evidence of unobviousness.

As the aforesaid prior art is known by optical physicists to provide the respective benefits and improvements as set forth above, the physicist would have been led to make the obvious combination of these teachings in order to obtain the benefits this prior art taught and the artisan would typically readily recognize.

Although there is no explicit teaching to combine the aforesaid references, it is noted that the problem addressed by Applicant was known in the prior art. Adding a filter to remove a known noise problem leads to better signal quality and lowered operation costs. This motivation to combine the prior art teachings to arrive at the claimed invention comes from the knowledge of those skilled in the art and the nature of the problem solved. See *In re Dembiczak*, supra.

Art Unit: 3663

Here motivation comes from both the nature of the problem solved and the knowledge of one skilled in the art.

In response to Applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgement of obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicants' disclosure, such as reconstruction is proper. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the reason to combine is the prior art known need for precise signal data and the known problem of pump radiation noise.


In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F. 2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Applicants' argument that the combination of Heidemann and the admitted prior art would be inoperative is not cogent. It is immaterial whether or not a physical combination would be operational, as it is the showing of Heidemann using optical filters to pass signals and filter out noise that an artisan would recognize and use in other optical systems.

Art Unit: 3663

It is a fundamental fact that using an optical filter positioned before a detector to filter out noise and transmit signals is well known in general, and certainly in the art. Applicants' mere application of the filter for this same purpose provides no novel or unexpected results and is obvious.

Applicants' arguments as to the differing purposes for the filter of Applicants and that of Heidemann is not relevant as the pending claims fail to require any filter purpose beyond mere filtering.



NELSON MOSKOWITZ
PRIMARY EXAMINER